Volume IX, No. 32 HUMAN EVENTS August 6, 1952

ISLANDS OF FREEDOM

By EDNA LONIGAN

HUMAN EVENTS raised the question, at the time of MacArthur's return from Tokio, whether an aroused and angry people, without propaganda and organization, could defeat the machine. Chicago is the answer.

There is real danger that the public, shocked by the evidence of its own eyes, will say "a plague o' both their houses", and stay home Election Day. This only leaves to the machine complete and unchallenged control.

Discouragement over political parties and representative government in this country today is too ominously like the discouragement with Parliamentary government in Italy in 1920 or in Germany in 1930. We know now where that leads. The American people cannot give up the fight.

What is the machine with which we must contend if government by the people is not to perish from the earth?

Behind the mechanics of the two-party contest, the American people saw, with sure insight, that they were engaged in a struggle with a new kind of government, something wholly destructive of our Constitution.

This new government is One Party Government, or "democratic centralism", as the Communists call it. In One Party Government, the executive power or those who control it become all-powerful; and all opposition — political, economic or cultural — is impotent. It is called democratic because the masses are flattered or bribed or cajoled into giving their vote to their leaders, without resort to force.

This trend to monolithic government is world-wide. It rests on technical inventions no one planned. Every invention of our time — electricity, radio, television, airplanes — lends itself to the central control tower. The new State rests on the new technology as truly as Elizabethan free enterprise rested on the decentralizing effect of the compass and the improvements in ship design.

Since 1933, the political system of the United States has been slowly but steadily transformed into one closely resembling One Party Government. This is obvious — but not generally recognized. The Roosevelt Revolution provided the means. It gave the executive all the gold in the country and the depression-acquired right to expand credit without limit by using government debt as a "security" for bank loans. The Presidency acquired the power to make its own laws, and it built an energetic, militant army to carry out its aims; that is, an expanding Federal bureaucracy, and the satellite agencies attached to it by hook and line.

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1136 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN A LITTLE NOTICED BOOK called *The State,* Emil Lederer described the objective of the new totalitarianism. Its aim is to pulverize all institutions except the State, to take into captivity or reduce to rubble, all firms, all universities, all communities in which people can decide for themselves. The masses, left without leaders or channels of communication, become a formless mob, incapable of dissent. Centralized propaganda going out over the air waves from the center conditions everyone in the nation to obedience. Radio and television open every avenue of people's minds to central domination, as the cutting of the broad avenues through the slums of Paris opened every corner of the city to control of the imperial artillery.

Like a cancer, One Party Government in the United States moved ruthlessly to extend its power deep into the whole society. It took over most (but not quite all) of the Federal executive. It reached for the courts. It penetrated into Congress, into press, radio and television, the schools and colleges and hospitals. It moved in upon all producers — farmers, labor, industrialists, investors. It worked quietly to guide both political parties. These are not separate facts but a single inexorable process.

This One Party Government is not managed by the Democratic Party. It is managed by a small, able, self-appointed group of ambitious men. Anyone can join. The door is wide open. He need only be more ruthless than the man above him. There is a fascinating story in the struggle for power within the elite or palace guard which conforms perfectly to Hayek's rule that the worst inevitably get on top. But our concern here is with another point.

The power to govern is the power to punish. Every government must have the power to punish criminals. All ruling groups have an innate tendency to punish as criminals or enemies of society those who disagree with them or challenge their power.

Only the English-speaking people learned how to bar their rulers from punishing their critics in the name of the public good. That is what Magna Charta, the Stuart rebellion, and the American War for Independence were about. The British crown was forbidden to punish people by arresting them on its own say-so, detaining them in jail without trial, or trying them by its judges, except with a verdict by the people out of office (the jury).

The two-party method of debate and referendum is possible only under one condition — the government must not be strong enough to punish its opponents. No people can turn the party in power out of office by peaceful means unless the leaders of the opposition are protected against reprisals by those who want to stay in office.

Our Bill of Rights, the first ten amendments, was designed to prevent the government — even the new American government — from denying to its opponents the right

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to meet, to publish, to criticize, and to organize politically, or from punishing those who opposed it by arbitrary search, arrest, or punishment. Only behind this shield against punishment can the opponents of a government organize legally and form an opposition party. Only with it can the citizens be strong enough to raise a government or pull it down — except by open rebellion.

NO ONE can possibly understand the change in American government unless he sees how ingeniously the ruling group has restored all the old established methods by which arbitrary government punishes its opponents. In place of censorship we have smearing. In place of Star Chamber courts, we have income tax courts. In place of arbitrary seizure we have tax liens and administrative law. In place of denial of the right of assembly, we have seduction, bribery, and intimidation of the press and other means of communication.

Our government can punish the opposition today as kings have always punished it, except that, in our time, money takes the place of soldiery. All government benefits — lest we forget — serve as bait on the hook. They draw the fish in close so he can be more easily netted.

No opposition party or minority group (whether Republicans, Southern Democrats, or the lost Jeffersonian Democrats of the North) can defeat a ruling group holding the power to punish dissent.

Historically the only opponent strong enough to restrain absolute executive power is the Parliament or Congress.

The answer to the One-Party Presidency is not a different President but a different Congress. Only Congress can take away from the one-party elite now entrenched in office the power to punish — as the "Parliament of Runneymede" limited King John's power, or the Long Parliament took it from Charles I, or the Continental Congress took it from George III.

The crucial struggle of 1952 is not over the Presidency but over the Congress. Only Congress can reestablish the conditions of representative government, and make it possible for the two party system to function again. The American people cannot leave the issues of the next four years to one toss of the electoral dice. In the Congressional elections they have 500 choices. The men they elect will speak for them again and again in the next four years.

There is no question but what the Fair Deal cabal will give as much effort to getting control of Congress as of the Presidency. They are bitterly determined to eliminate "the class of 1946", as they call the Republican Senators up for election this year.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Benton has already served notice that the struggle in Congress is to the Fair Dealers every bit as important as the Presidency.

There is no question but that the Communists and their followers in the "United Front" will also give fully as much attention to Congress as to the Presidency. They devised the strategy for attack on the "Do-Nothing" 80th Congress and have bitterly fought every Congressional campaign for years.

HERE WE COME, however, to the question: What is Congress? What is "representative government?" Representative government is not central, but local. It came into existence because there were "islands" of free citizens, within the mass, unwilling to be subservient to the king, and strong enough or protected enough to say so. They might be cities, universities, nobles, clergy, any group which could protect itself against invasion by the central government.

All the great gains for liberty have been "reaction". Under King John's attempt to modernize the government, the clergy, the nobles and the towns turned back to their local liberties. Runneymede was fought by men who had islands of free men behind them. Under King Charles' attempt to go with the "trend of the times", the Parliamentary leaders turned back to their local liberties, conscious again of islands of free men to support them. George III was trying to bring British commerce into line with the new "trends" from the Continent. The Americans reasserted their ancient liberty which had grown strong in their isolation.

There is no strength in the "representatives" who come to Washington to set limits on the executive power except the strength of their communities back home. There is no strength to representative government except a local body of free voters, coming together in their own race, choosing a free man to speak for them, and standing with him against all attack.

We have lost all the advantage of "islands" which grew up naturally where free men could defend themselves. The artificial grids which divide a state up into its congressional districts are a far cry from Oxford, or the city of London, or Boston in 1775. But our Senators still represent a sovereign community, and the people in each Congressional district had better begin to think of the district where they vote as a citadel behind which they can barricade themselves against the invading central forces. Against that reduction of all human society to the uniformity of the dust storm there is only one defense.

A true Congress, a Congress which represents true "islands" of freedom, can be a shelter belt behind which a genuine two party system can reform, and against which the powers of One Party Government will beat in vain.

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. IX, No. 32 Wednesday, August 6, 1952 Washington, D. C.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED AUG 12 '52

Around the Town: Two stories have stirred Capital tongues in the past week.

(1) Professionals in the GOP are discussing a proposal that General Eisenhower fly to Murray Bay, Canada, where Sen. Taft is on vacation and ask the Senator for his full and active collaboration in the campaign. The proposal is variously attributed to Summerfield, the new GOP National Chairman, and (surprisingly) to Mr. Herbert Brownell. The latter directed the hatchet job on Taft for Dewey in the recent primary campaign.

(2) The other story concerns Mr. George Allen, former "court jester" of Truman, and more recently Eisenhower's most active promoter for the Presidency. Allen is joint owner with Ike of a large Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, farm. Allen sold many prominent business men on Ike for President, basing his plea on the claim that Ike would be a sure winner. According to reliable sources, Allen was asked last week whether he thought Ike could beat Stevenson. Allen gave the surprising reply: "Give me thirty days and I'll be able to tell you."

Fighting Campaign: In the first real cannonade of the election battle, Stevenson on August 3 said: "The American people must decide whether they want to entrust a foreign policy based on cooperation among free nations to the party which has created and cherished that policy — or to the party which has opposed that policy and is today split down the center in contortion of bitter division about it." Stevenson jibed at four GOP Senators — Bricker, Jenner, McCarthy and Kem — and asked how Eisenhower could possibly back such opponents of the Administration foreign policy.

Senator Dirksen replied, providing the first hard punching in this campaign. He retorted: "Adlai questions the right of General Eisenhower to carry on a crusade in company with such sturdy Americans as Senators Jenner, Bricker, Kem and McCarthy and other Republican nominees. Just how well does he think his associates look — Alger Hiss, Dean Acheson, Wilson Wyatt, the ADA and the Lavender Lads of the State Department? . . . I have spoken to Senators Jenner, Bricker, Kem and McCarthy and they are very willing to accept Adlai's challenge to meet him on these grounds during the campaign."

If Eisenhower would close ranks with Dirksen in similar vigorous attacks, his chances for the Presidency might vastly improve. If not, the real battle will take place — as Edna Lonigan remarks in the HUMAN EVENTS article this week — in the area of the congressional campaigns, for Senate and House.

Drought and Disaster: Dry weather on the Eastern Seaboard and in the South has caused the Department of Agriculture to declare an emergency and to designate as "disaster areas" a number of states. These are Maine, Massachusetts, Kentucky, Tennessee, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi and parts of Missouri and Arkansas. This means that farmers in those parts become eligible for low interest loans maturing in five years, if regular bank credit is not available to them. The occasion has

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

also enabled Mr. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, to call one of those regional meetings (so dear to the hearts of his publicity men) at Nashville to discuss the "emergency".

A few discordant reports somewhat spoiled Brannan's picture of the Federal Government hastening to succor the poor and afflicted. For instance (reported the New York *Times*, August 1), "Maine and Massachusetts sources . . . were somewhat surprised to find themselves declared disaster areas". Fred J. Nutter, Maine Commissioner of Agriculture, said Washington had been calling his office about declaring his State a disaster area, but he had declined because "there wasn't any demand for it". Mr. Nutter remarked that "they (the Federal Government) wanted us to ask for it and we didn't want it." As for Massachusetts, western counties were found to be "dry, but not in a critical condition". In Tennessee, when the Brannan junket arrived, it was found that the state government had already acted by sending a buyer to get hay from Wisconsin. Finally, Virginia showed some disinclination to be blanketed under the term "disaster area".

Now we do not suggest that the drought may not result in truly pitiful conditions in the areas mentioned. Nevertheless, we doubt that anyone will starve, because the Midwest has plenty of moisture and bumper crops are forecasted. Indeed, out there Brannan's men are manfully grappling with a contrary problem: a possible glut and descent of prices. Agriculture's Production & Marketing Division is trying to get farmers to put corn under Government loans. This move is designed to take corn out of the free market and thereby maintain higher prices.

The menace of abundance of crops is as great as the menace of drought. For the Democratic Administration, this is a year of disasters, emergencies — and elections.

Windfall: A month before Election Day, thanks to the last Congress, four and a half million Americans will be better off by about 12½ per cent, in terms of the dollar, according to a story in the *Wall Street Journal* today. For, on October 3rd, their social security checks will be larger by that percentage than they have been in the past. Just about the time they receive these checks, the battle cry "you never had it so good" will have reached its full crescendo. Perfect timing!

Nationalizing the Parties: The Constitution does not recognize political parties. In the machinery established for the succession of presidents, the presidential electors of each state in the Union, which is considered an autonomous unit, are subject to the will of the citizens of their respective states; this will, as expressed through the ballot, is supposed to govern the voting of the presidential electors. The purpose of this provision was to prevent the more populous states from exercising political domination over those sparsely settled.

This last vestige of states' rights is bothersome to the centralizers. It annoyed them no end at the recent Democratic Convention, when they tried to bind the delegates from the South by a "loyalty" pledge. The purpose of this pledge was to override the Constitutional procedure for selecting presidents; the intent was to make the electoral college a rubber stamp in the hands of the majority in the national party convention. The prerogative of a minority of states would thus be wiped out.

As an aftermath of this subtle perversion of the Constitution, a movement is afoot — according to *The New York Times*, August 4 — to have the next Congress enact a Federal statute that would in effect make this "loyalty" pledge mandatory. Under that law, if it is enacted, it would be impossible in practice for the Republicans or Democrats of any state to instruct their respective slates of electors to vote for any candidate who did not have the endorsement of the national convention of the party. The national convention, or its management, would have a copyright on the party symbol.

If passed, the law would amount to Federal recognition of political parties. This calls to mind the remark of Thomas Jefferson to the effect that if he could go to heaven only as a member of a political party, he would as lief go to the other place.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Conservative Britain: Some of the GOP party gatherings these days in Denver might well ponder the plight of the British conservative party, now in power, as described in the *Church Times* (Anglican) in the issue of July 25:

"Conservative experts themselves are in no doubt that, if there was a General Election now, their Party would suffer heavy defeat at the polls. The causes of this disappointment are mainfold. . . . At the time of the last General Election, the Conservative Party made explicit promises that, if returned to power, it would reverse the trend in favor of increasing official control over the freedom of the individual citizen. These promises have not been fulfilled, nor is there any sign of their fulfillment.

"The abolition of identity cards was a promising gesture to satisfy public opinion. It was little more. . . . Government spokesmen did not attempt to deny that much recent legislation has resulted in one encroachment after another on the liberty of the subject. Individual citizens are now at the mercy of a multitude of Administrative tribunals, from which there is no appeal to the High Court of Justice; a host of inspectors have the legal right to search private premises without warrant; daily life is governed more and more, not by a law, but by administrative regulations issued at the whim of Ministers and civil servants.

"Lovers of liberty must face the unpalatable fact that, on this issue, there is nothing to choose between a Labor and a Conservative Government. In spite of election promises and Party traditions, in spite — be it added — of the private convictions of many Conservative back-benchers, the present Government does not intend to lift its little finger to resist or to reverse the encroachment of the State on the freedom of the individual."

Crack in the Rampart? The constant, though unorganized, fight being waged against the collectivist indoctrination of our youth in schools and colleges is rewarded every now and then by some slight indication that the "enemy" is none too sure of himself. HUMAN EVENTS, which has done its share on the firing line, is glad to see in the July issue of *Harper's* an "Open Letter to Teachers" by Paul Woodling, Professor at Western Washington College of Education, in which he warns the teaching fraternity against ignoring the "ground swell of criticism (that) is running against us". The "Open Letter" was entered in the *Congressional Record* (July 22) by Rep. Paul W. Shafer, of Michigan.

Prof. Woodling spells out the charges against the teachers as follows: "That the public schools in a democracy belong, or ought to belong, to the people, but that professional educators have progressively preempted the responsibility for policy making. . . . That the philosophy of pragmatism . . . which has come almost completely to dominate educational thinking is unacceptable to a large number of Americans".

Then he goes on to say that "it is difficult to understand how any thoughtful educator can deny either of these two contentions". (The denial of both these charges has been the usual defense of the professional educators.) And he warns that unless a frank admission of error, and a willingness to make correction, is forthcoming, education will suffer, and educators will have to endure the most vicious kind of criticism. Professor Woodling has performed a great service for his profession — if they will heed his words.

At this point, we should emphasize the tremendous popular interest in the conflict over education in the past year. Three articles which we have published during the calendar years 1951 and 1952 have topped the list in popularity among our readers, as measured by orders for extra copies. These articles were, as follows: "Harvard Hogs the Headlines", by William F. Buckley, Jr., May 16, 1951 (containing material later published in Buckley's best-selling book, *God and Man at Yale*); "Storm Over Pasadena", by Frank Chodorov, June 13, 1951; and last week's (July 31, 1952) piece "Darkness at Noon in the American Colleges", by Professor E. Merrill Root of Earlham College. Root's piece has aroused great interest. Three daily newspapers have wired asking permission to reprint it, and we have received orders totalling almost 10,000 copies.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Spies, Dupes and Diplomats: By Ralph de Toledano. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce; Boston: Little, Brown and Company. $3.50. Reviewed by William Henry Chamberlin.

The Far East has been the scene of one of the greatest American defeats and one of the greatest Russian victories recorded in history. America has fought two desperate wars, one against Japan, the other against the Communist North Koreans and Chinese. America would never have become involved in this second war, which its leaders can neither end nor win, had Japan remained an oriental great power, with effective control of the Korean-Manchurian area.

Despite or rather because of these two wars the American position in the Orient is highly precarious. Half a billion Chinese are organized by a regime implacably hostile to this country, which even caricatures Dean Acheson as a bacteriological microbe. This does seem ungrateful, in view of Mr. Acheson's large contribution to the loss of China.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, with practically no fighting, has exceeded the wildest expansionist dreams of Tsarist diplomats. Its position in the Pacific area has been immensely bolstered by effective political, economic and ideological domination of China. It is able to wage wars by proxy against the western powers in the East, draining the manpower and resources of America in Korea, Britain in Malaya, France in Indo-China without sacrificing the life of a single Red Army soldier.

Ralph de Toledano, co-author of the most popular and effective exposé of the Hiss case, tries to determine how much stupidity and how much treason entered into this catastrophe. He pieces together the story of the Sorge spy ring in Japan, of the "Amerasia" case, about which there was so much official amnesia, the baleful role of the Institute of Pacific Relations, so ably revealed by the searching investigations of the McCarran subcommittee.

He raises some very interesting questions, on which there may be fuller historical proof later. He shows that while Communists and Communist sympathizers in Japan did everything in their power to divert Japan's attack away from Russia and toward the United States, the same elements in the United States wielded all their influence to insure a failure of Konoye's compromise proposals.

He shows how closely the political line favored by Owen Lattimore and others of his school of thought, in and out of the government, parallelled Russia's desire; a Japan "completely crushed and undergoing a Morgenthau treatment." Typical of the hard hitting style of the book is the effective characterization of Owen Lattimore as "selfmade scholar, champion of the Moscow Trials, indefatigable propagandist for the Soviet Union and for the Chinese Communists . . . the little man who was always there."

He remarks that the average American's verdict on the reputation of the State Department for honesty, integrity, veracity and loyalty would be "bad" and proves from official documents that Acheson contradicted himself completely on the strategic importance of Formosa and that Philip Jessup was suffering from a faulty memory, to say the least, when he testified under oath that the State Department had never considered the recognition of Red China. All in all, it is a fascinating book and contains much material of which an intelligent Republican campaign strategy could make devastating use. Little, Brown, which published a number of works by Owen Lattimore, has made suitable atonement for its "not so little Red" phase by publishing this work, which performs an excellent job of taking Lattimore to pieces.

Erratum: We apologize for an error in last week's issue, in the story entitled "The Race", line 16, which read "against Ike for his support of FEPC". The correct text is "against Ike for his opposition to FEPC".

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED